

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 25-20354

v.

Hon. Terrence G. Berg

SCOTT JAMES ROCKY,

Defendant.

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE THE PLEA CUTOFF DEADLINE,
PRETRIAL CONFERENCE, AND TRIAL DATE**

By and through their respective counsel, **THE PARTIES STIPULATE** and agree that there is good cause to continue, for 90 days, the following deadlines in this matter: the plea cutoff deadline, currently set for June 13, 2025, the final pretrial conference, currently scheduled for July 2, 2025, at 2:30 P.M.; and the trial date, currently scheduled for July 15, 2025, at 9:00 A.M.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED that the time period from July 15, 2025, through the new trial date to be set by the Court, shall be deemed excludable delay under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), and that the ends of justice served by continuing the motion cutoff deadline, the plea cutoff deadline, the final pretrial

conference, and the trial date outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

The parties stipulate and agree that an ends of justice continuance is appropriate for the following reasons:

1. The defendant is charged with violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2) (distribution of child pornography) and 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(5)(B) (possession of child pornography).

2. The United States has extended a plea offer to the defendant. Counsel for the parties communicated regarding the case and agree that the plea cutoff deadline, the final pretrial conference, and the trial date should be adjourned for 90 days to allow time for the parties can exchange and review information, for counsel to review discovery with his client, to meet with his client, and to discuss a potential resolution of this matter.

3. A continuance of the current plea cutoff/ pretrial conference and trial dates is necessary for all the reasons mentioned in the previous paragraph. A failure to grant the requested continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible or result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). Therefore, the ends of justice served by continuing the current dates, deadlines, and trial date

outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Accordingly, the parties request that the Court find that, under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), the period of delay be deemed excludable delay, and that the ends of justice served by continuing the plea cutoff/pretrial conference and trial dates outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

The parties also stipulate and agree that this stipulation and any order resulting therefrom shall not affect any previous order of pretrial detention or pretrial release.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

s/ Nhan Ho
Nhan Ho
Assistant United States Attorney
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Phone: 313-226-9632
nhan.ho@usdoj.gov

s/ Arthur J. Weiss
Arthur J. Weiss
Attorney for Defendant
30455 Northwestern Hwy, Suite 225
Farmington Hills, MI 48334
Phone: 248-855-5888
arthurweiss@ajweisslaw.com

Dated: June 18, 2025

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 25-20354

v.

Hon. Terrence G. Berg

SCOTT JAMES ROCKY,

Defendant.

**ORDER TO CONTINUE THE PLEA CUTOFF DEADLINE,
PRETRIAL CONFERENCE, AND TRIAL DATE**

The Court, having been fully advised by the respective parties,
states as follows:

IT IS ORDERED that the plea cutoff date, the pretrial conference
date, and the trial date are reset as follows:

Plea cutoff deadline: Friday, August 29, 2025

Final pretrial conference: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.

Trial: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 at 9:00 a.m.

IF IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time period from July 15,
2025 through October 14, 2025, shall be deemed excludable delay under
the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), and that
the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests

of the public and defendant in a speedy trial. The Court finds that an ends of justice continuance is appropriate for the following reasons:

4. The defendant is charged with violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2) (distribution of child pornography) and 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(5)(B) (possession of child pornography).

5. The United States has extended a plea offer to the defendant. Counsel for the parties communicated regarding the case and agree that the plea cutoff deadline, the final pretrial conference, and the trial date should be adjourned for 90 days to allow time for the parties can exchange and review information, for counsel to review discovery with his client, to meet with his client, and to discuss a potential resolution of this matter.

6. A continuance of the current plea cutoff/ pretrial conference and trial dates is necessary for all the reasons mentioned in the previous paragraph. A failure to grant the requested continuance would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible or result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). Therefore, the ends of justice served by continuing the current dates, deadlines, and trial date outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

This order shall not affect any previous order of pretrial detention or pretrial release.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terrence G. Berg
HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date Entered: June 18, 2025